#### **Analytical Data Package Prepared For**

## **Pacific Northwest National Lab**

Radiochemical Analysis By

### **STL Richland STLRL**

2800 G.W. Way, Richland Wa, 99354, (509)-375-3131.

Data Package Contains \_\_\_\_\_ Pages

Report Nbr: 34621

SDG Nbr	ORDER Nbr	CLIENT ID NUMBER	LOT Nbr	WORK ORDER	RPT DB ID	BATCH	
W05099_	S07-012	B1LBT8	J7A230265-1	JM8202AA	9JM82020	7079230	
Jay 4/25	,	B1LC67	J7A230265-2	JM8222AA	9JM82220	7079230	

Comments:



#### STL Richland

2800 George Washington Way Richland, WA 99354

Tel: 509 375 3131 Fax: 509 375 5590

www.stl-inc.com

### Certificate of Analysis

Pacific Northwest National Laboratories Sigma V Building Richland, WA 99352

March 23, 2007

Attention: Dot Stewart

SAF Number

S07-012

Date SDG Closed

January 22, 2007

Number of Samples

Two (2)

Sample Type

Water

SDG Number

W ater W 05099

Data Deliverable

45-Day / Summary

#### **CASE NARRATIVE**

#### I. Introduction

On January 23, 2007, two water samples were received at STL Richland (STLR) for radiochemical analysis. Upon receipt, the samples were assigned the following laboratory ID numbers to correspond with the Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PGW) specific IDs:

PGW ID#	STLR ID#	<b>MATRIX</b>	DATE OF RECEIPT
B1LBT8	JM820	WATER	1/23/07
B1LC67	JM822	WATER	1/23/07

#### II. Sample Receipt

The samples were received in good condition and no anomalies were noted during check-in.

#### III. Analytical Results/Methodology

The analytical results for this report are presented by laboratory sample ID. Each set of data includes sample identification information, analytical results and the appropriate associated statistical errors.

The requested analyses were:

#### **Liquid Scintillation Counting** Enriched Tritium by method RICH-RC-5024

#### IV. **Quality Control**

The analytical results for each analysis performed includes a minimum of one laboratory control sample (LCS), one method (reagent) blank, and one duplicate sample analysis. Any exceptions have been noted in the "Comments" section.

QC and sample results are reported in the same units.

#### V. Comments

#### **Liquid Scintillation Counting**

Enriched Tritium by method RICH-RC-5024

The first analysis gave a blank result of 14.0 pCi/L. The batch was recounted and gave results of 10.6 pCi/L. The results of the samples are 10 times greater than the blank or more. Data is accepted. Except as noted, the LCS, batch blank, samples and sample duplicate are within contractual limits.

I certify that this Certificate of Analysis is in compliance with the SOW, both technically and for completeness, for other than the conditions detailed above. Release of the data contained in this hard copy data package has been authorized by the Laboratory Manager, or a designee as verified by the following signature.

Reviewed and approved:

Sherryl A. Adam Project Manager

#### **Drinking Water Method Cross References**

	DRINKING WATER	ASTM METHOD CROSS REFERENCES
Referenced Method	Isotope(s)	STL Richland's SOP number
EPA 901.1	Cs-134, I-131	RICH-RC-5017
EPA 900.0	Alpha & Beta	RICH-RC-5014
EPA 903.1	Ra-226	RICH-RC-5005
EPA 904.0	Ra-228	RICH-RC-5005
EPA 905.0	Sr89/90	RICH-RC-5006
ASTM D2460	Total Radium	RICH-RC-5027
Standard Method 7500-U-C & ASTM D5174	Uranium	RICH-RC-5058
EPA 906.0	Tritium	RICH-RC-5007
NOTE:		
The Gross Alpha LCS is prepared with Am-24		
The Gross Beta LCS is prepared with Sr/Y-90	(unless otherwise s	pecified in the case narrative)

#### **Uncertainty Estimation**

STL Richland has adopted the internationally accepted approach to estimating uncertainties described in "NIST Technical Note 1297, 1994 Edition". The approach, "Law of Propagation of Errors", involves the identification of all variables in an analytical method which are used to derive a result. These variables are related to the analytical result (R) by some functional relationship, R = constants \* f(x,y,z,...). The components (x,y,z) are evaluated to determine their contribution to the overall method uncertainty. The individual component uncertainties  $(u_i)$  are then combined using a statistical model that provides the most probable overall uncertainty value. All component uncertainties are categorized as type A, evaluated by statistical methods, or type B, evaluated by other means. Uncertainties not included in the components, such as sample homogeneity, are combined with the component uncertainty as the square root of the sum-of-the-squares of the individual uncertainties. The uncertainty associated with the derived result is the combined uncertainty  $(u_c)$  multiplied by the coverage factor (1,2, or 3).

When three or more sample replicates are used to derive the analytical result, the type A uncertainty is the standard deviation of the mean value (S/vn), where S is the standard deviation of the derived results. The type B uncertainties are all other random or non-random components that are not included in the standard deviation.

The derivation of the general "Law of Propagation of Errors" equations and specific example are available on request.

**Report Definitions Action Lev** An agreed upon activity level used to trigger some action when the final result is greater than or equal to the Action Level. Often the Action Level is related to the Decision Limit. The QC preparation batch number that relates laboratory samples to QC samples that were prepared and analyzed Batch together. Defined by the equation (Result/Expected)-1 as defined by ANSI N13.30. Bias COC No Chain of Custody Number assigned by the Client or STL Richland. Poisson counting statistics of the gross sample count and background. The uncertainty is absolute and in the same Count Error (#s) units as the result. For Liquid Scintillation Counting (LSC) the batch blank count is the background. Total Uncert (#s) All known uncertainties associated with the preparation and analysis of the sample are propagated to give a measure of the uncertainty associated with the result, u<sub>c</sub> the combined uncertainty. The uncertainty is absolute and in the u<sub>c</sub>\_Combined same units as the result. Uncertainty. The coverage factor defines the width of the confidence interval, 1, 2 or 3 standard deviations. (#s), Coverage **Factor** Contractual Required Detection Limit as defined in the Client's Statement Of Work or STL Richland "default" CRDL (RL) nominal detection limit. Often referred to the reporting level (RL) Decision Level based on instrument background or blank, adjusted by the Efficiency, Chemical Yield, and Volume Lc associated with the sample. The Type I error probability is approximately 5%. Lc=(1.645 \* Sqrt(2\*(BkgrndCnt/BkgrndCntMin)/SCntMin)) \* (ConvFct/(Eff\*Yld\*Abn\*Vol) \* IngrFct). For LSC methods the batch blank is used as a measure of the background variability. Lc cannot be calculated when the background count is zero. The number assigned by the LIMS software to track samples received on the same day for a given client. The Lot-Sample No sample number is a sequential number assigned to each sample in the Lot. MDC|MDA Detection Level based on instrument background or blank, adjusted by the Efficiency, Chemical Yield, and Volume with a Type I and II error probability of approximately 5%. MDC = (4.65 \* Sqrt((BkgrndCnt/BkgrndCntMin)/SCntMin) + 2.71/SCntMin) \* (ConvFct/(Eff \* Yld \* Abn \* Vol) \* IngrFct). For LSC methods the batch blank is used as a measure of the background variability. **Primary Detector** The instrument identifier associated with the analysis of the sample aliquot. The U-234 result divided by the U-238 result. The U-234/U-238 ratio for natural uranium in NIST SRM 4321C is Ratio U-234/U-238 1.038. Rst/MDC Ratio of the Result to the MDC. A value greater than 1 may indicate activity above background at a high level of confidence. Caution should be used when applying this factor and it should be used in concert with the qualifiers associated with the result. Rst/TotUcert Ratio of the Result to the Total Uncertainty. If the uncertainty has a coverage factor of 2 a value greater than 1 may indicate activity above background at approximately the 95% level of confidence assuming a two-sided confidence interval. Caution should be used when applying this factor and it should be used in concert with the qualifiers associated with the result. Sample Identifier used by the report system. The number is based upon the first five digits of the Work Order Report DB No Number. The equation Replicate Error Ratio =  $(S-D)/[sqrt(TPUs^2 + TPUd^2)]$  as defined by ICPT BOA where S is the original RER sample result, D is the result of the duplicate, TPUs is the total uncertainty of the original sample and TPUd is the total uncertainty of the duplicate sample. SDG Sample Delivery Group Number assigned by the Client or assigned by STL Richland upon sample receipt. The sum of the reported alpha spec results for tests derived from the same sample excluding duplicate result where Sum Rpt Alpha Spec Rst(s) the results are in the same units. The LIMS software assign test specific identifier. Work Order The recovery of the tracer added to the sample such as Pu-242 used to trace a Pu-239/40 method. Yield

STL Richland Report 3/22/2007 2:59:31 PM Lab Code: STLRL FormNbr: R FormatType: FEAD Version: 05 Rpt Nbr: 34621 File Name: h:\Reportdb\edd\FeadIV\Rad\W05099.Edd, h:\Reportdb\edd\FeadIV\Rad\V34621.Edd Test Lab Client QC Contract SAF Nbr Sdg Moisture/ Distilled Sample Collection Sample Id: ld: User Nbr Nbr: Type: Solids%\*: Volume On Date: Date: B1LBT8 9JM82020 MW6-SBB-A1 S07-012 W05099 01/23/2007 13:32 Batch Analyte CAS# Result Unit CntU 2S TotU 2S MDA TrcYield Method Qual Ala Size Unit Analy Date/Time Act 7079230 H-3 10028-17-8 9.18E+01 pCi/L 1.0E+01 1.9E+01 5.28E+00 100.0 TRITIUM\_ELECT\_L 1.50E-01 03/20/2007 15:27 Lab Client Test Contract SAF Nbr Sdg QC Distilled Moisture/ Sample Collection Sample Id: ld: User Nbr Nbr: Type: Solids%\*: Volume On Date: Date: 9JM82220 B1LC67 MW6-SBB-A1 S07-012 W05099 01/23/2007 12:31 Batch Analyte CAS# Result CntU 2S TotU 2S Qual MDA **TrcYield** Unit Method Alg Size Unit Analy Date/Time Act

5.28E+00 100.0

TRITIUM ELECT L 1.50E-01

7079230

H-3

10028-17-8

5.83E+02

pCi/L

2.0E+01 1.0E+02

03/20/2007 18:39

Thursday, March 22, 2007 STL Richland QC Blank Report Lab Code: STLRL

FormNbr: R FormatType: FEAD VersionNbr: 05 File Name: h:\Reportdb\edd\FeadIV\Rad\W05099.Edd, h:\Reportdb\edd\FeadIV\Rad\34621.Edd

**Lab Sample Id:** JNG032AB **Sdg/Rept Nbr:** W05099 34621 **Collection Date:** 01/23/2007 13:32

Client Id: NA Matrix: WATER WATER Sample On Date:

Moisture/Solids%\*: QC Type: BLK Received Date: 01/23/2007

SAF Nbr Contract Nbr Test User Case Nbr SAS Nbr Suffix Decant Distilled Volume File Id FSuffix RTyp

MW6-SBB-A19981

atch # / Analyt/ Result/ Tot/Cnt Qu- Tracer Spk Conc/ Analy Alig Date/Time RPD/ BER/ LCS F

Tot/Cnt Spk Conc/ Batch #/ Analyt/ Result/ Tracer Analy Aliq Date/Time RPD/ RER/ R CAS# al MDC Yield %Rec UCL LCL/UCL Typ Qc Type Orig Rst Unit Uncert 2S Method Size/ Analyzed UCL pCi/L 7.5E+00 TRITIUM ELE D 7079230 H-3 1.06E+01 5.30E+00 100.0 1.50E-01 03/20/2007

**BLK** 10028-17-8 6.6E+00 L 13:28

1

Thursday, March 22, 2007

#### STL Richland QC Control Sample Report

Lab Code: STLRL

FormNbr: R

FormatType: FEAD

VersionNbr: 05

File Name: h:\Reportdb\edd\FeadIV\Rad\W05099.Edd, h:\Reportdb\edd\FeadIV\Rad\34621.Edd

Lab Sample Id:

JNG032CS

Sdg/Rept Nbr: W05099

34621

Collection Date: 01/23/2007 13:32

Client Id:

NA

Matrix:

WATER

WATER

Sample On Date:

Moisture/Solids%\*:

QC Type:

BS

Received Date:

01/23/2007

SAFI		Contract Nbr W6-SBB-A19981	T	est User	Case	Nbr SA	AS Nbr	Suffix	Decant	Distilled Volume	File	ld		FSuffix AE	RTyp H
Batch # / Qc Type	Analyt/ CAS#	Result/ Orig Rst	Unit	Tot/Cnt Uncert 2S	Qu- al	MDC	Tracer Yield	Spk Conc/ %Rec	Analy Method	Aliq Size/	Date/Time Analyzed	RPD/ UCL	RER/ UCL	LCS LCL/U	R CL Typ
7079230 <b>BS</b>	H-3 10028-17-8	3.82E+02 8	pCi/L	6.8E+01 1.6E+01		5.35E+00	100.0	4.54E+02 84.2	TRITIUM_ELE	1.5004E-01 L	03/20/2007 14:46			70 130	D

Thursday, March 22, 2007 STL Richland QC Duplicate Report

FormNbr: R FormatType: FEAD VersionNbr: 05 File Name: h:\Reportdb\edd\FeadIV\Rad\W05099.Edd, h:\Reportdb\edd\FeadIV\Rad\34621.Edd

Lab Sample Id: JM8202CR Sdg/Rept Nbr: W05099 34621 Collection Date: 01/23/2007 13:32

Client Id: B1LBT8 Matrix: WATER WATER Sample On Date:

Moisture/Solids%\*: QC Type: DUP Received Date: 01/23/2007

SAF Nbr Contract Nbr Test User Case Nbr SAS Nbr Suffix Decant Distilled Volume File Id FSuffix RTyp S07-012 MW6-SBB-A19981 AC H

Batch #/ Analyt/ Result/ Tot/Cnt Qu-Tracer Spk Conc/ Analy Aliq Date/Time RPD/ RER/ LCS R Qc Type CAS# Orig Rst Unit Uncert 2S al MDC Yield %Rec Method Size/ Analyzed UCL UCL LCL/UCL Typ 7079230 H-3 9.75E+01 pCi/L 2.0E+01 5.29E+00 100.0 TRITIUM ELE 1.50E-01 03/20/2007 0.4 D 6.0 DUP 10028-17-8 8.7E+00 9.18E+01 17:21 20.0 3

STL Richland

U Qual - Analyzed for, but the result is less than the Mdc or gamma scan did not identify the nuclide.

Lab Code: STLRL

J Qual - No U qualifier has been assigned and the result is below the Reporting Limit (CRDL).

B Qual- Analyte was found in the associated laboratory blank above the MDC.



## Data Review/Verification Checklist RADIOCHEMISTRY, First Level Review

3/21/2007 3:58:03 PM

Lot No., Due Date:

J7A230265; 03/09/2007

Client, Site:

384868; PGW 615HANFORD HANFORD

QC Batch No., Method Test: 7079230; RH3EE H3EE by LSC

SDG, Matrix:

W05099; WATER

SDG, Wathx. W05099, WATER			
1.0 COC 1.1 Is the ICOC page complete; includes all applicable analysis, dates, SOP numbers, and revisions?	Yes	No	N/A
2.0 QC Batch 2.1 Do the Summary/Detailed Reports include a calculated result for each sample listed on the QC Batch Sheet?	Yeş	No	N/A
2.2 Are the QC appropriate for the analysis included in the batch?	Yes	No	N/A
2.3 Is the Analytical Batch Worksheet complete; includes as appropriate, volumes, count times, etc?	Yes	No	N/A
2.4 Does the Worksheets include a Tracer Vial label for each sample?	Yes	No	N/A
3.0 QC & Samples 3.1 Is the blank results, yield, and MDA within contract limits?	Yes	No	N/A
3.2 Is the LCS result, yield, and MDA within contract limits?	Yes	No	N/A
3.3 Are the MS/MSD results, yields, and MDA within contract limits?	Yes	No	N/A
3.4 Are the duplicate result, yields, and MDAs within contract limits?	Yes	No	N/A
3.5 Are the sample yields and MDAs within contract limits?	Yes	No	N/A
4.0 Raw Data 4.1 Were results calculated in the correct units?	Yes	No	N/A
4.2 Were analysis volumes entered correctly?	Yes	No	N/A
4.3 Were Yields entered correctly?	Yes	No	N/A
4.4 Were spectra reviewed/meet contractual requirements?	Yes	No	N/A
4.5 Were raw counts reviewed for anomalies?	Yes	No	N/A
5.0 Other 5.1 Are all nonconformances included and noted?	Yes	No	N/A
5.2 Are all required forms filled out?	Yes	No	N/A
5.3 Was the correct methodology used?	Yes	No	N/A
5.4 Was transcription checked?	Yeş	No	N/A
5.5 Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?	Yes	No	N/A
5.6 Are worksheet entries complete and correct?	Yes	No	N/A
6.0 Comments on any No response: See NCM. 10.09601			
First Level Review On Quelius Date 3-23	67		
STL Richland QAS_RADCALCv4.8.26	Page	9 1	



#### Data Review Checklist RADIOCHEMISTRY Second Level Review

OC Batch Number:	7079230
•	W05099

A. Sample Analysis  1. Are the sample yields within acceptance criteria?  2. Is the sample Minimum Detectable Activity < the Contract Detection Limit?  3. Are the correct isotopes reported?  B. QC Samples  1. Is the Minimum Detectable Activity for the blank result ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  2. Does the blank result meet the Contract criteria?  3. Is the blank result < the Contract Detection Limit?  4. Is the blank result > the Contract Detection Limit but the sample result < the Contract Detection Limit?  5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?  7. Is the LCS minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?	Review Item	Yes (V)	No (V)	$N/A(\sqrt{)}$
2. Is the sample Minimum Detectable Activity < the Contract Detection Limit?  3. Are the correct isotopes reported?  B. QC Samples  1. Is the Minimum Detectable Activity for the blank result ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  2. Does the blank result meet the Contract criteria?  3. Is the blank result < the Contract Detection Limit?  4. Is the blank result > the Contract Detection Limit but the sample result < the Contract Detection Limit?  5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?  7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?				
2. Is the sample Minimum Detectable Activity < the Contract Detection Limit?  3. Are the correct isotopes reported?  B. QC Samples  1. Is the Minimum Detectable Activity for the blank result ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  2. Does the blank result meet the Contract criteria?  3. Is the blank result < the Contract Detection Limit?  4. Is the blank result > the Contract Detection Limit but the sample result < the Contract Detection Limit?  5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?  7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?	1. Are the sample yields within acceptance criteria?			
3. Are the correct isotopes reported?  B. QC Samples  1. Is the Minimum Detectable Activity for the blank result ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  2. Does the blank result meet the Contract criteria?  3. Is the blank result < the Contract Detection Limit?  4. Is the blank result > the Contract Detection Limit but the sample result < the Contract Detection Limit?  5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?  7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?	2. Is the sample Minimum Detectable Activity < the Contract			
B. QC Samples  1. Is the Minimum Detectable Activity for the blank result ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  2. Does the blank result meet the Contract criteria?  3. Is the blank result < the Contract Detection Limit?  4. Is the blank result > the Contract Detection Limit but the sample result < the Contract Detection Limit?  5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?  7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?				
1. Is the Minimum Detectable Activity for the blank result ≤ the Contract Detection Limit? 2. Does the blank result meet the Contract criteria? 3. Is the blank result > the Contract Detection Limit? 4. Is the blank result > the Contract Detection Limit but the sample result < the Contract Detection Limit? 5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria? 7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit? 8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria? 9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria? C. Other 1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted? 2. Are all required forms filled out? 3. Was the correct methodology used? 4. Was transcription checked? 5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency? 6. Were units checked?				
Contract Detection Limit?  2. Does the blank result meet the Contract criteria?  3. Is the blank result < the Contract Detection Limit?  4. Is the blank result > the Contract Detection Limit but the sample result < the Contract Detection Limit?  5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?  7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?				
2. Does the blank result meet the Contract criteria?  3. Is the blank result < the Contract Detection Limit?  4. Is the blank result > the Contract Detection Limit but the sample result < the Contract Detection Limit?  5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?  7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?	<ol> <li>Is the Minimum Detectable Activity for the blank result ≤ the</li> </ol>			
3. Is the blank result < the Contract Detection Limit?  4. Is the blank result > the Contract Detection Limit but the sample result < the Contract Detection Limit?  5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?  7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?			/	
4. Is the blank result > the Contract Detection Limit but the sample result < the Contract Detection Limit?  5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?  7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?				
result < the Contract Detection Limit?  5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?  7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?				
5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?  7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?				
7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?		1		
Limit?  8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?	5. Is the LCS recovery with contract acceptance criteria?			
8. Do the MS/MSD results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?	7. Is the LCS Minimum Detectable Activity ≤ the Contract Detection			
9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?				
criteria?  C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?				
C. Other  1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted?  2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?	9. Do the duplicate sample results and yields meet acceptance			
1. Are all Nonconformances included and noted? 2. Are all required forms filled out? 3. Was the correct methodology used? 4. Was transcription checked? 5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency? 6. Were units checked?				
2. Are all required forms filled out?  3. Was the correct methodology used?  4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?		·		
3. Was the correct methodology used? 4. Was transcription checked? 5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency? 6. Were units checked?				{
4. Was transcription checked?  5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?  6. Were units checked?				
5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency? 6. Were units checked?				
6. Were units checked?	4. Was transcription checked?			
3. (10)	5. Were all calculations checked at a minimum frequency?	. //		
Comments on any 'No" response: See NCM	6. Were units checked?			
	Comments on any "No" response:			
				•
			,	

### Clouseau Nonconformance Memo



NCM #: 10-09607

NCM Initiated By: Pam Anderson Date Opened: 03/22/2007

Date Closed:

Classification: Anomaly

Status: GLREVIEW

Production Area: Environmental - Prep

Tests: H3EE by LSC

Lot #'s (Sample #'s): J7A230265 (1,2), J7A260000

(394),

QC Batches: 7079230

Nonconformance: Blank result above Contract Limit

Subcategory: Unknown

#### Problem Description / Root Cause

Name Pam Anderson <u>Date</u>

**Description** 

03/22/2007 The blank on this tritium enrichment in water is high. The first count has a result of

14.0 pCi/L. The batch was recounted. The recount result is 10.6 pCi/L. The recount data will be accepted. The results of the samples are 10 times greater that the blank

or more.

#### Corrective Action

<u>Name</u>

<u>Date</u>

**Corrective Action** 

Pam Anderson 03/2

03/22/2007 The procedure is being watched closely.

#### **Client Notification Summary**

Client

**Project Manager** 

Notified

Response How Notified

Note

Response

Response Note

#### **Quality Assurance Verification**

Verified By

**Due Date** 

<u>Status</u>

**Notes** 

This section not yet completed by QA.

#### Approval History

Date Approved

Approved By

**Position** 

Date Printed: 3/22/2007

PN	WO 5099 Due 13.09.07
	W05099
j	11 2 10 11
H	AUL 13 07 01

C.O.C.#

PNNLO 77	W050	099	7		CHAIN OF	CUSTODY	SAMPLE ANALYSI	S REQUEST		S07-012-588
du	é 03	09:	07							Page <u>1</u> of <u>1</u>
	Fluor Hanfor				Contact/Re Dot Stev		-	Telephone No.	MSIN	FAX
D2 XX 2104	F. M. HALL				Sampling 6			509-376-5056 Purchase Order/Cha	rge Code	
S07-012 Project Title	-				Hanford Hanford	Site				
SURV. DECEMI	BER 2006			******		INF-N-	506 3	Ice Chest No.	-06-8	Temp.
Shinned To (Lah) Severn Trent Inc.		11. 4			Method of	Shipment		Bill of Lading/Air Bi	II No.	
Protocol	ornorated, RE	nana	**************************************	2070(4)P)(1000(4)	Govt. Ve			Offsite Property No.	·	
SURV						Pri	ority: 45 Days	Olisite Property No.		
POSSIBLE SAMP  ** ** Contains Rad releasable per DOE Or	ioactive Materia	al at con	centrations that	are not regulat	ed for transportation per 49	OCFR but are not	SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS All Labs except WSCF: Batch all PNNL closure of 14 days. WSCF: Batch all PNNL GW samples sul		, S, and W 07 SA	rity Exemption: Yes V No Lars into one SDG, not to exceed SDG
Sample No.	Lab ID	*	Date	Time	No/Type Container		Sample Analysi	s		Preservative
B1LBT8		W	1-23-07	1332	1x20-mL P	Activity Scan	1			
B1LBT8		W	4	1	3x1000-mL P	TRITIUM_ELECT	_LSC_LL: H-3 (1)	Non	ne	
		-								
		+					TM 820		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		+								
							1. A MARKANINA M			
		-								
							and the second s			
									**************************************	
	<u> </u>									
Relinquished By Fluor Hanic	print Print		Sign		Date/Time 1400	Received By	Print Sign	Date/Time 14(X) JAN 2 3 2007		Matrix *
F. M. HALL Relinquished By		jo	- suc	JA	Date/Time	Received By	by FRIC DARBY	Date/Time	SE = 5 SO = 5 SL = 5	Solid T = Tissue Sludge WI = Wine
Relinquished By					Date/Time	Received By		Date/Time	0 = 0 A = 0	
Relinquished By					Date/Time	Received By		Date/Time		
FINAL SAMPLI DISPOSITION	E Disposal	Method	(e.g., Return to	customer, per	lab procedure, used in proc	ess)	Disposed By		*****	Date/Time

PNNL 57/	42302 WOSC 203.0:	165 1999 90	7		CHAII	N OF (	CUSTODY/S	SAMPLE ANALY	SIS REQUEST	3		S07-012-	
Collector Flu	or Hanford		***************************************			Contact/Re			Telephone No.	MSI	<del>'</del>	AX	
	VI. HALL		<del></del>			Dot Stew Sampling C		The state of the s	509-376-5056 Purchase Order			<del></del>	
S07-012 Project Title						Hanford !			- Mariana Mari	-			
SURV. DECEM			····			HN	F-W-50	6 3	Ice Chest No.	-06 -2	Temp.		
Shinned To (Lah) Severn Trent Inc		hland				Method of : Govt. Ve			Bill of Lading/A				
Protocol	ANTONOMICAL INTO		***************************************			GOVE VE		prity: 45 Days	Offsite Property	No.			
SURY POSSIBLE SAME ** ** Contains Rar releasable per DOE Of	dioactive Materia	al at cone	ncentrations that	are not regulat	æd for transpor	rtation per 49		SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS All Labs except WSCF: Batch all P closure of 14 days. WSCF: Batch all PNNL GW samp		L, G, I, S, and W 07	:tivity Exemp SAFs into one	tion: Yes SDG, not to exceed	No List SDG
Sample No.	Lab ID	*	Date	Time	No/Type (	Container		Sample An	nalysis			Preservative	
B1LC67		W	1-23-07	1231	1x20-mL	P	Activity Scan			None			
B1LC67		w	11	1	3x1000-m	nL P	TRITIUM_ELECT_	LSC_LL: H-3 (1)		None			
								Jmg	2.7				
Relinquished By	Print		Size		Date/T	ime 1400	Received By	Print Sign	Date/Time		N	fatrix *	
Fluor Hand Relinquist & HALL		<b>Z</b>	M	1	Date/Ti	2007	Received By	y ERIC DONLY	JAN 2 3 20 Date/Time	SE SO SL	= Soil = Sediment = Solid = Sludge	DS = DA D1. = DA T = Ti W1 = W	rum Lioui issue /ine
Relinquished By			***************************************		Date/Ti	ime	Received By	Market and the second s	Date/Time	0 :	= Water = Oil = Air	1. = Li V = Ve X = Or	egetation
Relinquished By					Date/Ti	ime	Received By		Date/Time			And Andrews and Annex and	
FINAL SAMPL DISPOSITION		Method	l (e.g., Return to	customer, per	lab procedure,	, used in proc	ess)	Disposed By	- Marie Andrews Andrews -		Date/I	îme	19 <del>7-1111-11-11-11-1</del>

## TITE GIL

Sample Check-in List

D	late/Time Received.	1/23/	0714	100	-14 144 127101			
C	lient: PNL		SDG #:	W05	299 NA 11	Sar h	507-017	
W	ork Order Number!	J7A3	3026	5	hain of Cusso		7-017,53	Via No mode
	upping Container II							8,288
	Custody Sea				ir Billi #			
2	Custody Seal						1 Yes [4 No []	
3.	Chain of Cus					NA (	) Yes ( 1 No ! )	
4	Cooler ternne	rature:	present /				Yes INNO!	
5	Number of sa	moles in ab	- NA	7 5 Veri	miculite/pack	ing materis	Yes ( No ! :	1.00y ( )
7	Sample holdir		.PPmg con	tainer:	مل	manage accounts		
3.	Samples have		recasa?				Tyes[] No[]	
Ģ	custody				- Jay	azard label Opropriate	s Samples labels	
10.	broken Sample pH take		NATI	»U 2 ( )	(Unly fo	r samples	bles requiring head space	(8)
11	Sample Location*For documents	n, Sample Mononly,	College		pH>2 (1)	pH>9[]	Yes (Y No[]	
12	Were any anom	alies identi	fied in com	nis action n	eded.			
* 5	Description of a	nomaties (i	nclude sam	ibie unuperi	s)		Yes () No (	,
	the desired state of the state	Ene 1	Donly				7 1400	
	23.000	Analy	sis Requeste	d	Condition		Comments/Activ	n l
Clien; In	aformed on		y		Person			
[ ] No	action necessary; pro	ocess as is.			e scoon coll	HC(C()	the confidence of the state of the state of the the state of the state	-7 sun
	Vanager				Data			
LS-023.	9/03, Rev. 5		- Annual control of the control of t	- Andrews of the state of the s	" Nuc		and the desire of a particular section of the secti	

84868, Pacific Northwest National Laborate acific Northwest National Lab  nalyDueDate: 03/09/2007  atch: 7079230 WATER p EQ Batch, Test: None All Tests: 7026394 A  Work Order, Lot, Sample DateTime Amt/Unit  JM820-2-AA 7A230265-1-SAMP	U3 Enri 51 CLIE CI/L		Quote: SA ,	57671		Pipet #: Sep1 DT/Tm Tech: Sep2 DT/Tm Tech: Prep Tech:	
malyDueDate: 03/09/2007 atch: 7079230 WATER p EQ Batch, Test: None All Tests: 7026394 A  Work Order, Lot, Sample DateTime Amt/Unit  JM820-2-AA 7A230265-1-SAMP	5I CLIE OCI/L SU3, 7079230 ASU3, Initial Aliquot	PM,  QC Tracer	Quote: SA ,			Sep2 DT/Tm Tech:	
All Tests: 7026394 A  Work Order, Lot, Sample Date Time Amt/Unit  JM820-2-AA  7A230265-1-SAMP	SU3, 7079230 ASU3, Initial Aliquot	QC Tracer	Count			•	
Work Order, Lot, Sample DateTime Amt/Unit  JM820-2-AA 7A230265-1-SAMP	Initial Aliquot	QC Tracer	Count			•	
Sample DateTime		QC Tracer	Count			ricp reen.	
Sample DateTime				II Detector	Count On	Off II CD Analyst	II Comments
7A230265-1-SAMP				Id	(24hr) Circ		Comments:
1/20/2001 10:02	AmtRec: 20ML,3XLP	#Containers: 4			Scr:	Alpha: 8.23E-05 uCi/Sa	Beta: -7.17E-06 uCi/Sa
JM820-2-AC-X	-						
'A230265-1-DUP							
1/23/2007 13:32	AmtRec: 20ML,3XLP	#Containers: 4			Scr:	Alpha: 8.23E-05 uCi/Sa	Beta: -7.17E-06 uCi/Sa
JM822-2-AA	110						
A230265-2-SAMP							
1/23/2007 12:31	AmtRec: 20ML,3XLP	#Containers: 4			Scr:	Alpha: -3.81E-04 uCi/Sa	Beta: 6.64E-04 uCi/Sa
JNG03-2-AA-B	Min. and a second secon						
'A260000-394-BLK							
	AmtRec:	#Containers: 1			Scr:	Alpha:	Beta:
JNG03-2-AC-C							
'A260000-394-LCS 	***************************************				·····		
	AmtRec:	#Containers: 1			Scr:	Alpha:	Beta:
JNG03-2-AD-B							
'A260000-394-BLK 	# * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *				*******		
<b></b>	AmtRec:	#Containers: 1			Scr:	Alpha:	Beta:
7.20,2007 10.02	Annico.	"Jonanois, I			JOI.	ripita.	Deta.
STL Richland Key: In - Initial Amt, fi - Fina Richland Wa. pd - Prep Dt, r - Referer			-	ISV	- Insufficient Volum	e for Analysis	WO Cnt: 6

3/21/2007 3:35:58 PM

# ICOC Fraction Transfer/Status Report ByDate: 3/21/2006, 3/26/2007, Batch: '7079230', User: \*ALL Order By DateTimeAccepting

Q Batch	Batch Work Ord CurStatus			Accepting		Comments
7079230				U-10-W-1-10-MIN-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11		
AC		CalcC	BlackCL	3/20/2007 10:23:05		
SC			andersonp	IsBatched	3/20/2007 10:09:52 AM	ICOC_RADCALC v4.8.26
SC			BlackCL	InCnt1	3/20/2007 10:23:05 AM	RICH-RD-0001 REVISION 3
SC			BlackCL	CalcC	3/21/2007 7:09:25 AM	RICH-RD-0001 REVISION 3
AC			BlackCL	3/21/2007 7:09:	25	

AC: Accepting Entry; SC: Status Change

STL Richland Richland Wa.